

REMARKS

Introduction:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 have been amended with claims 3, 5 and 7-12 having been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is being presented. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 are pending and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Claims:

On page 2 of the Office Action, the claims were objected to. However, since the claims have been amended in view of the comments in the Office Action, it is believed that the objections to the claims are traversed. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objections be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yang (KR 10-0373769) in view of Dittmer (US Publication No. 2003/0146843). These rejections are overcome.

Regarding the rejection of claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 recites a DC power source supply charging a battery with external AC power and supplying a driving power to each element of the repeater when an electric power failure occurs, including a rectifier for converting AC power from the power line into DC power, a step-down transformer for converting DC power inputted from the rectifier into power, and a charging circuit for charging a battery with the power inputted from the step-down transformer.

That is, in the present invention, a DC power source supply charges a battery with external AC power and supplies a driving power to each element of the repeater when electric power failure occurs. These features are not disclosed in the cited references.

Indeed, with respect to the claimed DC power source supply, it is noted that only Yang has been cited as even providing a battery charger 109. Without acknowledging the accuracy of this allegation (or lack thereof), applicant submits that Yang clearly does not disclose the claimed DC power source supply charging a battery with external AC power and supplying a

driving power to each element of the repeater when an electric power failure occurs. Nor does Yang specifically disclose the claimed rectifier for converting AC power from the power line into DC power, the claimed step-down transformer for converting DC power inputted from the rectifier into power, or the claimed charging circuit for charging a battery with the power inputted from the step-down transformer.

Here, even if it is correct to state that “[it] is common and well known in the art that a charge includes a step down transformer and a rectifier,” as suggested by the Examiner, applicant submits that Yang certainly does not disclose the claimed charging circuit for charging a battery with the power inputted from the step-down transformer, as claimed.

Thus, it is believed that claim 1 is patentably distinguished from any combinations of the references and that, therefore, the rejection of claim 1 is believed to be overcome.

Regarding the rejections of claim 2, it is noted that claim 2 depends from claim 1 and that the rejection of claim 2 is believed to be overcome for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejections of claims 3, 5, 7 and 8, it is noted that these claims are cancelled and that these rejections are, therefore, moot.

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yang in view of Dittmer and further in view of Garton et al. (US 5,134,644). However, regarding the rejection of claim 4, since claim 4 depends from claim 1 and since the additional citation to Garton does not cure the defects of Yang and Dittmer, the rejection of claim 4 is believed to be overcome for at least the reasons set forth above. Regarding the rejection of claim 9, it is noted that claim 9 has been cancelled and that, therefore, the rejection of claim 9 is moot.

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 6 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yang in view of Dittmer and further in view of Morales (US 6,215,404). However, regarding the rejection of claim 6, since claim 6 depends from claim 1 and since the additional citation to Morales does not cure the defects of Yang and Dittmer, the rejection of claim 6 is believed to be overcome for at least the reasons set forth above. Regarding the rejections of claims 10-12, it is noted that claims 10-12 have been cancelled and

that, therefore, the rejection of these claims are moot.

Conclusion:

In accordance with the foregoing, applicant notes that the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested. The Office is invited to contact applicant's attorneys at the below-listed telephone number concerning this Amendment or otherwise regarding the instant application. If there are any charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account no. 06-1130 maintained by applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,
Cantor Colburn LLP

By /Amy Bizon-Copp/
Amy Bizon-Copp
Registration No.: 53,993
Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115

Date: January 3, 2008